ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 040894-5940

Application No.: 10/615,067

Page 5

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully

requested in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 5-6, 10 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by

U.S. Patent No. 6,916,873 to Yamanoto et al.

Claims 7 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yamanoto et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 5 by incorporating the features of claim 10 into claim 5,

and canceled claim 10 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 5-7 and 11-17

remain pending in this application for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-6, 10 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by

Yamanoto et al. Claims 7 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yamanoto et al. To the extent that the rejections might be applied against the

claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed as being based on a reference or a

combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features

recited in the claims.

1-WA/2770753.1

With regard to independent claim 5, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Yamanoto et al.</u> does not teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least a recited feature of "wherein the curing catalyst comprises a urea compound."

In contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claim 5, Yamanoto et al. merely discloses in col. 9, lines 6-15 that the silane coupling agent may include urea group. Applicants respectfully submit that the silane coupling agent of Yamanoto et al. does not correspond to the claimed "curing catalyst." Specifically, in the present invention, as described at lines 1-2 on page 6 of the specification, "[t]he filler particles may be subjected to surface treatment with a silane coupling agent." That is, the silane coupling agent is used to bond the inorganic material and the resin. Moreover, the silane coupling agent is liquid, whereas the claimed "curing catalyst" is used to cure the resin and urea is powder. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Yamanoto et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least the feature of "wherein the curing catalyst comprises a urea compound," as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claim 5 under 35

U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Yamanoto et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in newly-amended independent claim 5. Moreover, the rejection of its dependent claims 6-7 and 11-17 should also be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 040894-5940

Application No.: 10/615,067

Page 7

discussed above with regard to independent claim 5 and for the additional features that they

recite.

Without other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-7 and 11-17

are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments,

reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that

there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to

contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge

the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should

also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP

By:

Xiaobin You

Reg. No. L0112

Dated: <u>June 7, 2007</u>

CUSTOMER NO. 009629 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Tel 202.739.3000

Fax 202.739.3001

1-WA/2770753.1